

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected. New claims 3-5 are added. Claims 1 and 2 are amended herein to clarify the invention.

The Abstract has been objected to for not being a single paragraph and for exceeding 150 words. Applicant respectfully notes that the present application is a National Stage of a PCT application and that, therefore, the Abstract is not required to be limited to only one paragraph of 150 or fewer words (See MPEP §1826).

The disclosure has been objected to because the specification includes references to the claims. Such references to the claims are removed herein.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Office Action states that the plurality of intermediate expanding portions recited in claim 2 must be shown in the drawings or removed from the claims. Figures 1 and 2 show an intermediate expanding portion (13). Showing a plurality of intermediate expanding portions in a drawing would not help in the understanding of the invention since an intermediate expanding portion is already shown in the drawings. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by JP-60-165591 (JP '591). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element

as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *See Verdegaal Brothers Inc. v. Union Oil Company of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Claim 1, as amended, recites several limitations which are absent from JP’591. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, (1) a wedge body support portion with a substantially constant width narrower than a trapezoidal shape portion and the wedge body support portion extending in a longitudinal direction; (2) each of first and second expanding members having a longitudinal surface extending in a longitudinal direction contiguously formed with a respective second tapered surface, the wedge body support portion being arranged between the longitudinal surfaces and the longitudinal surfaces being substantially parallel to each other; and (3) the springs being arranged so as to bias first and second expanding members in a direction towards the wedge so as to transmit a biasing force to the wedge through each of the longitudinal surfaces. JP ‘591 fails to disclose any of the three enumerated limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over JP ‘591 and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Claim 2 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends from a patentable base claim. *See In re Royka and Martin*, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974).

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by JP-49-35442 (JP ‘442). Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, (1) a wedge body support portion with a substantially constant width narrower than a trapezoidal shape portion and

the wedge body support portion extending in a longitudinal direction; (2) each of first and second expanding members having a longitudinal surface extending in a longitudinal direction contiguously formed with a respective second tapered surface, the wedge body support portion being arranged between the longitudinal surfaces and the longitudinal surfaces being substantially parallel to each other; and (3) the springs being arranged so as to bias first and second expanding members in a direction towards the wedge so as to transmit a biasing force to the wedge through each of the longitudinal surfaces. JP '442 fails to disclose any of the three enumerated limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over JP '442 and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP '442. Claim 2 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends from a patentable base claim.

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP-4-70389 (JP '389) in view of GB 1,065,361 (the '361 patent). Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, (1) a wedge body support portion with a substantially constant width narrower than a trapezoidal shape portion and the wedge body support portion extending in a longitudinal direction; (2) each of first and second expanding members having a longitudinal surface extending in a longitudinal direction contiguously formed with a respective second tapered surface, the wedge body support portion being arranged between the longitudinal surfaces and the

longitudinal surfaces being substantially parallel to each other; and (3) the springs being arranged so as to bias first and second expanding members in a direction towards the wedge so as to transmit a biasing force to the wedge through each of the longitudinal surfaces. JP '389 in view of the '361 patent fails to disclose any of the three enumerated limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over JP '389 in view of the '361 patent and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Claim 2 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends from a patentable base claim.

New claims 3-5 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended and new claims 3-5 have been added. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found, for example, in Figure 1, Figure 2, and in the specification on the paragraph bridging pages 6-7.

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$225.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO

is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038